U.S. DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FILED

JUN 2_5 2003 Daniel V. Thompson (TX State Bar #19909200) THOMPSON & GUSTAVSON, L.L.P. ROBERT H. 2 High Point Centre JA, CLERK 12225 Greenville Avenue, Suite 995 DEPUTY 3 Dallas, TX 75243 CV03: (972) 479-0900, (972) 479-0215 (facsimile) 4 James C. McMichael, Jr. (LA Bar #10443) 5 MCMICHAEL, MEDLIN & D'ANNA, L.L.C. 504 Texas St. 6 P.O. Box 72 Shreveport, LA 71161-0072 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA (318) 221-1004, (318) 221-0008 (facsimile) SOUTHERN DIVISION AT SANTA ANA Robert D. Buyan (CA Bar #138270) STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS, L.L.P. 4 Venture, Suite 300 Irvine, CA 92618-3320 JUDGE HICKS 10 (949) 450-1750, (949) 450-1764 (facsimile) MAGISTRATE JUDGE PAYNE 11 Attorneys for Defendant 12 PROGRESSIVE STAMPING AND PLATING, INC. 13 14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 15 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 16 Civil Action No. 17 RAYMOND SELLEK, JR. SA02-842AHS(ANx)18 Plaintiff, ANSWER OF PROGRESSIVE STAMPING AND PLATING, INC. 19 V. 20 PROGRESSIVE STAMPING 21 AND PLATING, INC.. ENTER ON ICMS HARDWARE RESOURCES, 22 L.L.C., and JOHN DOES 1-10, OCT 1 7 2002 23 Defendants. 24 25 Comes now defendant Progressive Stamping and Plating, Inc. (hereinafter 26 "PSPI"), responding to the Complaint of Raymond Sellek, Jr. (hereinafter "Sellek"), as follows:

- 1. The allegations of Paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 12, and 16 are admitted.
- 2 2. The allegations of Paragraphs 8, 13, 15, 20-25, 27 and 28 are denied.
- 3. PSPI is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the
- 4 allegations of Paragraph 5.
- 5 4. In response to Paragraph 2, PSPI is a Louisiana corporation with its
- 6 principal place of business at the address indicated in Bossier City, LA. PSPI also has
- 7 a facility at 820 Rockefeller, Suite G, Ontario, CA. Hardware Resources, L.L.C. is
- 8 no longer in existence, having been merged into PSPI in the year 2000. PSPI does not
- 9 have any information concerning any "John Does". PSPI denies the remaining
- 10 allegations.
- In response to Paragraph 6, PSPI admits that Sellek has obtained several
- 12 copyright registrations, is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the
- 13 allegation that Sellek is applying for registrations, and denies the remaining
- 14 allegations.
- 15 6. In response to Paragraph 7, PSPI admits that Sellek has obtained several
- 16 copyright registrations, denies that true and correct copies are attached to the copy of
- 17 the Complaint served on PSPI (only pages 1 of 2 were attached), is without
- 18 information sufficient to form a belief as to the allegation that copies of the specimens
- 19 are attached to the Complaint, and denies the remaining allegations.
- 7. In response to Paragraph 9, PSPI admits that it has marketed, sold and
- 21 advertised wood carvings substantially similar to not only Sellek's wood carvings but
- 22 also numerous other wood carvings that preexisted Sellek's wood carvings, and denies
- 23 the remaining allegations.
- 24 8. In response to Paragraph 10, PSPI admits that Exhibit 2 to the Complaint
- 25 is a copy of a fax received by PSPI and that there were other communications, and
- 26 denies the remaining allegations.
- 9. In response to Paragraph 11, PSPI denies that Sellek has at any time had
- 28 any valid copyrights, denies that PSPI has ever had knowledge of any valid copyrights,

- 1 and admits the remaining allegations.
- 2 10. In response to Paragraph 14, PSPI admits that it purchased Sellek's
- 3 corbels in California, and denies the remaining allegations.
- 4 11. In response to Paragraph 17, PSPI admits it shipped the corbels out of
- 5 California, and denies the remaining allegations.
- 6 12. In response to Paragraph 18, PSPI admits this is a copyright infringement
- 7 cause of action, and denies the remaining allegations.
- 8 13. In response to Paragraph 19, PSPI repeats and realleges its responses to
- 9 Paragraphs 1-18.
- 10 14. In response to Paragraph 26, PSPI repeats and realleges its responses to
- 11 Paragraphs 1-25.

12 Affirmative Defenses

- 13 15. First affirmative defense: The Copyright Infringement and "Fraud"
- 14 Claims for relief are barred by res judicata and/or collateral estoppel, in that a prior
- 15 judgment from the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana
- has declared that Sellek's wooden corbels are not copyrightable (Exhibit 1 hereto).
- 17 16. Second affirmative defense: The "Fraud" Claim for Relief fails to state a
- 18 claim upon which relief may granted, in that it omits the following elements of fraud:
- 19 misrepresentation or concealment, intent to defraud, justified reliance, and damage
- 20 caused by reliance.
- 21 17. Third affirmative defense: The Court does not have subject matter
- 22 jurisdiction or venue under the "first-filed" rule, because of the prior-filed Louisiana
- 23 action.
- 24 Prayer
- 25 WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, PSPI respectfully requests that
- 26 Sellek take nothing, that PSPI be awarded its costs and attorneys fees, and that it be
- 27 granted such

28

other and further relief to which it may be entitled. Dated: ktober 15, 2002 Respectfully submitted, Daniel V. Thompson
Thompson & Gustavson, L.L.P.

Pro hac vice (applied-for) Robert D. Buyan Stout, Uxa, Buyan & Mullins, L.L.P. Local counsel

5

RECEIVED	W.S. DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIAN
UNITED ST	ATES DISTRICE COURT
UCI O 1 2WOR THE WESTE	RN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA OCT 1 0 2002
ROGERT H. SHEMWELL, CLERK SERKI MESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA	EVEPORT DIVISION HJERT H. SMERNELL, CLERK
PROGRESSIVE STAMPING AND	DEPUTY
PLATING, INC. d/b/a HARDWARE	· ·
RESOURCES,)
ŕ	Civil Action No. CV02-1664-S
Plaintiff,	j
,) Judge Stagg
V3.)
)
RAYMOND SELLEK,)
Defendant.) JURY DEMANDED

ORDER

The Court having examined the foregoing Motion and being of the opinion that it should be granted;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that a default judgment be entered against defendant, Raymond Sellek. declaring that its wooden corbels are not items protected by the United States Copyright Act.

SIGNED this the day of day

JUDGE

DATE: 10 111. 02

BY: DM

TO: Mc Michael

Sellek

 \bigcirc

5 (Ex 1, Pg. 1 of 1)

EXHIBIT

1 2 PROOF OF SERVICE 3 4 I am a citizen of the United States of America, and not a party to the within action. I am 5 employed at Stout, Uxa, Buyan & Mullins, LLP having a business address of 4 Venture, Suite 6 300, Irvine, CA 92618. 7 On the date executed below I caused to be served by U.S. first class mail the following 8 document: 9 ANSWER OF PROGRESSIVE STAMPING AND PLATING, INC. 10 on the parties or their counsel shown below by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope 11 addressed by as follows: 12 13 Brian R. Reiss 3700 Campus Drive, Suite 204 14 Newport Beach, CA 92660 15 and then by sealing the envelope(s) and depositing same, with postage fully prepaid, in the mail 16. at Irvine, California. 17 I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct. 18 Executed on October 15, 2002 at Irvine, California, County of Orange. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28